

MSCI RESPONSE TO THE ASIC CONSULTATION PAPER 292: IMPLEMENTING THE FINANCIAL BENCHMARK REGULATORY REGIME

MSCI

August 2017

MSCI supports ASIC's efforts to improve benchmark quality and integrity through ASIC's proposal. MSCI also supports ASIC's efforts in aligning to international standards. MSCI appreciates opportunity to comment on this consultation and we are available for any questions that ASIC may have.

ABOUT MSCI

MSCI is a leading provider of investment decision support tools to institutional investors globally, including asset managers, banks, hedge funds and pension funds. MSCI products and services include indexes and portfolio risk and performance analytics. MSCI has research and commercial offices around the world. MSCI has over 6000 customers worldwide across MSCI's different business units.

MSCI's flagship equity indexes include the MSCI Global Equity Indexes. The MSCI Global Equity Indexes have been calculated for more than 40 years, and today MSCI calculates over 190,000 equity indexes per day. MSCI Global Equity Index families include country and regional indexes, size indexes (large cap, small cap, and micro-cap), sector indexes, style (value/growth) indexes, strategy indexes, thematic indexes and ESG indexes. MSCI also calculates custom indexes at the request of clients, by applying client screens and constraints to MSCI Global Equity Indexes.

MSCI Global Equity Indexes are used worldwide by:

- assets owners to help them with their mandate decisions and with reviewing their managers' performance;
- active asset managers so that they can actively manage their funds against an index and report performance;
- passive fund managers to issue passive funds and ETFs based on the indexes;
- broker dealers for providing trading execution services, creating OTC and non-OTC derivative financial products and writing research more generally;
- stock exchanges to create equity index linked futures and options contracts; and
- CCPs to calculate the risks of its positions for index linked futures and options contracts.

In each of 2014, 2015 and 2016, MSCI announced that it successfully completed an assurance review of its implementation of the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks. MSCI engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) to perform the reviews. The full report, including the PwC assurance review, for MSCI equity indexes (as well as select IPD real estate indexes and benchmarks) are available at www.msci.com/products/indexes/regulation.html.

MSCI COMMENTS

Question Number	Question	MSCI response
B1Q1	Do you agree with our approach to maintaining international and cross-border regulatory consistency?	Yes, we generally agree with the use of the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks (IOSCO Principles), provided that the proportionality regime within the IOSCO Principles, including the comply and explain regime, is preserved to allow for applicability across different types of benchmarks.
B2Q1	Do you have feedback on the five proposed additional requirements set out under proposal B2?	<p>(a) We would question the need for capital requirements in Sections 2.1.5 and 2.1.7 given that benchmark administrators, as administrators, are not managing client monies, taking deposits or issuing financial products. This is also inconsistent with the EU benchmark regulation. We would also question the obligation around resourcing. While ensuring that staff is qualified, it is very subjective to require that an “appropriate” number of people support a particular task. Is that x or x+1 or x+2 people and how is that to be proven or evidenced?</p> <p>(b) We believe that the risk management under the benchmark regulation should be related to administration and not cover more risks such as general “legal” risks which can go well beyond administration and are outside the scope of administration activities.</p> <p>(c) The record keeping obligations can be onerous for equity price data, in particular real-time data. The EU benchmark regulation includes a carve out for this data from record keeping because it can be obtained from the stock</p>

		<p>exchanges. Generally, we believe that the time period for retention should be 5 years so that it is consistent with IOSCO Principles and regulation such as the EU benchmark regulation.</p>
<p>B3Q1</p>	<p>Do you agree with our proposed approach to rulemaking and regulatory guidance?</p>	<p>We agree with aligning with the IOSCO Principles and other regulation to promote international consistency. We also agree that proportionality should be adopted to address differences in types of benchmarks. In that light:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to define contributors as those contributing data that is created solely for use in the benchmark, otherwise organizations like stock exchanges that provide stock prices for equity benchmarks become contributors (and that is inconsistent with the IOSCO Principles and the EU benchmark regulation). • The definition of “Interest” is unclear and seems circular. The benchmark doesn’t measure the price the assets. The benchmark measures the market, and uses the price of the underlying assets to do so. To align with international regulation believe that it should refer to the price of the underlying asset. For equity benchmarks, we believe that is the stock prices. While other data can be used for index calculation, such as FX rates, numbers of shares, etc. the “input data” or “interest” for the equity benchmark is the stock price. • We believe that 2.1.1(b)(iv) should be deleted. The benchmark should measure the market in accordance with its methodology. It should not take into consideration the strategy or goal of the financial products issued on it, otherwise it introduces conflicts of interest into the benchmark decision making process. The impact on the performance of financial products should not be a consideration in benchmark decisions, for example.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe that 2.1.2(a)(v) should be deleted. Distribution of indexes should not be considered an administration function. Indexes are typically distributed through standard data feeds provided by varieties of distributors and terminals and that goes beyond “administration” in other regulation, which generally refers to the development, maintenance and calculation of benchmarks. • In Section 2.2.1, we believe that the benchmark would measure the relevant market not the Interest. Please see above. • In Section 2.2.2, input data not always be transactional, especially in private markets. That should be provisioned for as in the IOSCO Principles, for example. • In Section 2.2.4, ASIC should not receive any information prior to the market and if the information is publicly disclosed it is unclear why a separate notification needs to be sent to ASIC. • We believe that Section 2.6.1(a) should be deleted. The Interest is not the administrator’s data. Administrators typically will not have the right to make that data public. It would require the administrator to breach its agreements with the data provider. For example, for equity indexes, equity prices (closing and real-time) are the stock exchange’s data, not the administrator’s, and the stock exchanges impose contractual restrictions on the use/distribution of their data. Further, a similar clause was specifically deleted from the EU benchmark regulation, so this requirement would be inconsistent with the EU benchmark regulation. No such equivalent provision is in the IOSCO Principles. • We believe that Section 2.6.2 should be deleted. While we support efforts to improve benchmark standards, we believe that forcing the public disclosure of commercial terms and conditions (including fees) and the licensing of
--	--	---

		<p>benchmarks on non-discriminatory terms is unnecessary for the development, calculation and maintenance of benchmarks, and is inconsistent with the IOSCO Principles as well as other benchmark regulation in other jurisdictions. It is not relevant to improving benchmark standards and has the potential to introduce a competitive distortion in an otherwise competitive marketplace. As such, we believe that it is overreaching.</p>
<p>B3Q2</p>	<p>Does the alignment between the proposed administration rules and regulatory guidance, and international or overseas regulatory requirements need to be adjusted? If so, please provide details in your response.</p>	<p>We believe that RG 000.22 should be deleted for the reasons outlined above in relation to Section 2.1.1(b)(iv) the administration rules.</p> <p>We believe that the reference to dissemination should be deleted from RG 000.26 as we have explained above.</p> <p>We believe that resourcing requirements under RG 000.39 should be deleted as they are very subjective.</p> <p>We believe that RG 000.42 should be deleted as explained above.</p> <p>We believe that RG 000.48 should reference the market to be measured, not the Interest, as explained above.</p> <p>We believe that RG 000.54 is far more onerous to similar international rules and should be revised. Global equity benchmarks can use data from 70-80 stock exchanges globally with 80-100 more data providers for data such as number of shares, FX rates, fundamental data, etc. To require changes to contracts with all of those data providers for the Australian regulation is more than the IOSCO Principles or the EU benchmark regulation. If the data is not create solely for the purpose of benchmark calculation (and instead has an independent purpose), it is unclear why codes of conduct or contractual renegotiations with hundreds of data vendors is necessary or appropriate.</p> <p>For RG 000.58, please see above. For RG 000.64, the benchmark administrator does not have this information. The product issuer does and any financial product transition plan needs to be owned and handled by the financial product issuer, not the benchmark</p>

		<p>administrator.</p> <p>We believe that the “Guidelines or code of conduct on the responsibilities of contributors” is unworkable for the reasons identified above. For equity indexes, data can be submitted on a real time or end of day basis. The requirements for contributors would not work in practice and also seem unnecessary where data (such as stock exchange prices, FX rates, companies earnings) has a separate independent purposes outside of benchmark calculation. “Contributors” should be those who provide data that is created solely for benchmark calculation (and not data that has an independent purpose).</p> <p>For RG 000.70, please see above.</p> <p>For the section titled “Fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory access”, we believe this should be deleted as explained above.</p> <p>For the compelled rules, we believe that contributors should be limited to those providing data that is created solely for benchmark calculation.</p>
C1Q1	Do you have feedback on the list of potential significant benchmarks based on the criteria in the draft legislation?	We believe that significant benchmarks should only have that designation if there are no reasonable substitutes in the market place.

CONTACT US

clientservice@msci.com

AMERICAS

Americas	1 888 588 4567 *
Atlanta	+ 1 404 551 3212
Boston	+ 1 617 532 0920
Chicago	+ 1 312 675 0545
Monterrey	+ 52 81 1253 4020
New York	+ 1 212 804 3901
San Francisco	+ 1 415 836 8800
Sao Paulo	+ 55 11 3706 1360
Toronto	+ 1 416 628 1007

EUROPE, MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA

Cape Town	+ 27 21 673 0100
Frankfurt	+ 49 69 133 859 00
Geneva	+ 41 22 817 9777
London	+ 44 20 7618 2222
Milan	+ 39 02 5849 0415
Paris	0800 91 59 17 *

ASIA PACIFIC

China North	10800 852 1032 *
China South	10800 152 1032 *
Hong Kong	+ 852 2844 9333
Mumbai	+ 91 22 6784 9160
Seoul	00798 8521 3392 *
Singapore	800 852 3749 *
Sydney	+ 61 2 9033 9333
Taipei	008 0112 7513 *
Thailand	0018 0015 6207 7181 *
Tokyo	+ 81 3 5290 1555

* = toll free

ABOUT MSCI

For more than 40 years, MSCI’s research-based indexes and analytics have helped the world’s leading investors build and manage better portfolios. Clients rely on our offerings for deeper insights into the drivers of performance and risk in their portfolios, broad asset class coverage and innovative research.

Our line of products and services includes indexes, analytical models, data, real estate benchmarks and ESG research.

MSCI serves 97 of the top 100 largest money managers, according to the most recent P&I ranking.

For more information, visit us at www.msci.com.

NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, charts (collectively, the “Information”) is the property of MSCI Inc. or its subsidiaries (collectively, “MSCI”), or MSCI’s licensors, direct or indirect suppliers or any third party involved in making or compiling any Information (collectively, with MSCI, the “Information Providers”) and is provided for informational purposes only. The Information may not be modified, reverse-engineered, reproduced or disseminated in whole or in part without prior written permission from MSCI.

The Information may not be used to create derivative works or to verify or correct other data or information. For example (but without limitation), the Information may not be used to create indexes, databases, risk models, analytics, software, or in connection with the issuing, offering, sponsoring, managing or marketing of any securities, portfolios, financial products or other investment vehicles utilizing or based on, linked to, tracking or otherwise derived from the Information or any other MSCI data, information, products or services.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information. NONE OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDERS MAKES ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION (OR THE RESULTS TO BE OBTAINED BY THE USE THEREOF), AND TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, EACH INFORMATION PROVIDER EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, in no event shall any Information Provider have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits) or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited, including without limitation (as applicable), any liability for death or personal injury to the extent that such injury results from the negligence or willful default of itself, its servants, agents or sub-contractors.

Information containing any historical information, data or analysis should not be taken as an indication or guarantee of any future performance, analysis, forecast or prediction. Past performance does not guarantee future results.

The Information should not be relied on and is not a substitute for the skill, judgment and experience of the user, its management, employees, advisors and/or clients when making investment and other business decisions. All Information is impersonal and not tailored to the needs of any person, entity or group of persons.

None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy.

It is not possible to invest directly in an index. Exposure to an asset class or trading strategy or other category represented by an index is only available through third party investable instruments (if any) based on that index. MSCI does not issue, sponsor, endorse, market, offer, review or otherwise express any opinion regarding any fund, ETF, derivative or other security, investment, financial product or trading strategy that is based on, linked to or seeks to provide an investment return related to the performance of any MSCI index (collectively, “Index Linked Investments”). MSCI makes no assurance that any Index Linked Investments will accurately track index performance or provide positive investment returns. MSCI Inc. is not an investment adviser or fiduciary and MSCI makes no representation regarding the advisability of investing in any Index Linked Investments.

Index returns do not represent the results of actual trading of investable assets/securities. MSCI maintains and calculates indexes, but does not manage actual assets. Index returns do not reflect payment of any sales charges or fees an investor may pay to purchase the securities underlying the index or Index Linked Investments. The imposition of these fees and charges would cause the performance of an Index Linked Investment to be different than the MSCI index performance.

The Information may contain back tested data. Back-tested performance is not actual performance, but is hypothetical. There are frequently material differences between back tested performance results and actual results subsequently achieved by any investment strategy.

Constituents of MSCI equity indexes are listed companies, which are included in or excluded from the indexes according to the application of the relevant index methodologies. Accordingly, constituents in MSCI equity indexes may include MSCI Inc., clients of MSCI or suppliers to MSCI. Inclusion of a security within an MSCI index is not a recommendation by MSCI to buy, sell, or hold such security, nor is it considered to be investment advice.

Data and information produced by various affiliates of MSCI Inc., including MSCI ESG Research Inc. and Barra LLC, may be used in calculating certain MSCI indexes. More information can be found in the relevant index methodologies on www.msci.com.

MSCI receives compensation in connection with licensing its indexes to third parties. MSCI Inc.’s revenue includes fees based on assets in Index Linked Investments. Information can be found in MSCI Inc.’s company filings on the Investor Relations section of www.msci.com.

MSCI ESG Research Inc. is a Registered Investment Adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and a subsidiary of MSCI Inc. Except with respect to any applicable products or services from MSCI ESG Research, neither MSCI nor any of its products or services recommends, endorses, approves or otherwise expresses any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies and MSCI’s products or services are not intended to constitute investment advice or a recommendation to make (or refrain from making) any kind of investment decision and may not be relied on as such. Issuers mentioned or included in any MSCI ESG Research materials may include MSCI Inc., clients of MSCI or suppliers to MSCI, and may also purchase research or other products or services from MSCI ESG Research. MSCI ESG Research materials, including materials utilized in any MSCI ESG Indexes or other products, have not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body.

Any use of or access to products, services or information of MSCI requires a license from MSCI. MSCI, Barra, RiskMetrics, IPD, FEA, InvestorForce, and other MSCI brands and product names are the trademarks, service marks, or registered trademarks of MSCI or its subsidiaries in the United States and other jurisdictions. The Global Industry Classification Standard (GICS) was developed by and is the exclusive property of MSCI and Standard & Poor’s. “Global Industry Classification Standard (GICS)” is a service mark of MSCI and Standard & Poor’s.